



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

now in large measure the law of life in all our Christian communities. It ought to be given at least a trial or two in international life before it is declared to be impracticable there.

The President's frequent use of the words injustice, "insolent aggression," and the like, in regard to possible malignant purposes of foreign powers towards us is most unfortunate. He wishes "cordial and sincere friendship" to exist between us and all other nations; but dark hints of a spirit of insolent aggression in them is the best possible means of preventing them from feeling cordial friendliness towards us. If we expect other nations to trust us and believe in our assertions of disinterested regard for them, we must trust them in a generous way. That is the immutable law of friendship. If we openly charge them, however indirectly and hypothetically, with hostile feelings against us, who can blame them for feeling that we are very unfair and essentially hostile toward them, notwithstanding all our high pretensions of "acting" toward them in a spirit of just and generous recognition of all their rights?

### **The Greatest Battle in History—The Greatest Dishonor.**

Certain editors and correspondents, and a good many other people, too, have been entertaining themselves since the beginning of the recent gigantic battle at Moukden with calculations to show that it has been the greatest battle ever fought in human history.

Most of these calculations have revealed no sense of anguish at the direfulness of the stupendous duel, every move in which has been attended with the wholesale slaughter and mangling of thousands of men and the desolation of innumerable far-away homes. A certain keen intellectual relish seems to have been taken by these people in the atrocious conflict, as if the soldiers who have been shooting and bayoneting one another, and suffering and dying in frightful masses, had been nothing more than lifeless pieces on an immense chessboard, or wooden pins at the end of some huge bowling alley. The big battle with its hundred miles of fighting men has been spoken of as if it had been a fine and noble event, worthy to be recorded alongside the truly great occurrences of the world's history. Its very bigness seems, in the minds of many, to have clothed it with extraordinary excellence and attractiveness, and to have covered up its inherent ghastliness and shame.

It is hard to understand this cold and heartless attitude of mind in people calling themselves civilized, people trained in our schools and in our churches, who are thoroughly tender and humane in common life, people who are driven to the verge of nervous wreck by the death and ruin caused by a boiler explosion like that, for instance, which re-

cently destroyed a hundred people in Brockton, Mass. These same people can, many of them, read with positive pleasure the accounts of the great butcheries of men about Moukden. The multiplication of the horrible explosion by thousands on every hillside, in every gorge and glen, where the big shrieking shells tumble in every minute with their deliverances of hell, transforms for them the whole business; it turns darkness into light; and, like ignorant children who see nothing back of the flaming spectacle, they shout: "Splendid! Magnificent! Glorious!"

What is the cause? The false ideas of war which have so long ruled the world, and perverted both men's judgment and their moral sense. If only men could tear themselves loose from these old conceptions, from the tyrannous power of a crude and senseless public sentiment and have the courage to look at things as they are, in the light of their own reason, there would not be left a man on the earth to say a single word in condonement of the ghastly tragedy in Manchuria.

This has indeed been the greatest battle in history. It has thrown more men into deadly array against one another than any other recorded engagement. It has cost more in life and treasure. It has been the fullest of horrible *mêlés*. But for this very reason it has been the greatest dishonor in the annals of man. The excuses which might be offered for the ancient barbarities cannot be made for it. It has taken place at the opening of this twentieth century, not in the days of the Huns and Visigoths. It has been a murderous deed of midnight executed openly at high noon. It shames every civilized man of us in every Christian country that such a thing has been possible at this late day. We are as guilty in our way as the perpetrators themselves. We have taught them or encouraged them in the cultivation of the arts of death. The great battle is therefore the world's sin and shame.

There are of course many people who have from the beginning felt the iniquity and dishonor of the conflict. The number of these increases daily as the war drags its bloody length over the hills and across the plains of Manchuria. The cry for peace, a final peace for the world too, is becoming louder and stronger day by day. Even war men are joining the ranks of those who demand peace. This gigantic struggle is too much for them. They like war—in the abstract. It is their profession. They can stand a fair amount of the butchery of men; a few "bloody angles" and ditches filled with dead and dying men do not greatly disturb their composure. But this "awful slaughter of human beings" in Manchuria is carrying the thing a little too far. It reaches the inmost depths of their natures, where conscience and humane feeling, still alive in spite of their profession, rise up in revolt against the awful business. Lord

Charles Beresford of the British navy, one of this class of men, said the other day in Pittsburg:

"The whole world is opposed to the outrageous conflicts that have been brought about in this war. It is shameful to think of the awful slaughter of human beings, and even should the hostile countries show any inclination to continue the fight, it will be but a question of time until other powers will interfere to prevent any further loss of life in such an atrocious fashion as has characterized all the battles in this fight. As a matter of fact, it seems altogether probable that this will prove the last of the big wars. Nearly all of the bigger countries seem to favor the abolition of such hostilities, and it will be only a matter of time until all international difficulties are adjusted in some other way than by going to war."

That is the lesson which this biggest battle in history, this greatest dishonor of humanity, is impressing upon men. If Lord Beresford only had the courage to go to the end of his logic, he would not stop with the "big wars." He would say "all wars" must go, and he would hasten their going by going out of the business himself. The only way in which big wars differ from little ones is that there is more of them. But it is more of the same kind. The shamefulness is in the war itself, not in the size of it.

Neither of the nations whose immense armies have fought and bled about Moukden have laid up for themselves any honor thereby. The time is not remote when all men, in Russia and Japan as well as elsewhere, will look back upon the shameful scene with utter amazement that it could ever have been.

### **Hon. John D. Long on Increase of the Navy.**

Any utterance of Hon. John D. Long upon the matter of the navy naturally attracts and deserves attention, as he recently occupied the position of Secretary of the Navy for a considerable period and has otherwise had wide experience in public affairs.

In an article entitled "Shall the Navy be Increased?" which appeared in the *Independent* for March 23, Mr. Long expresses himself as opposed to any present enlargement of the navy, and thus takes a position in direct opposition to the views held by President Roosevelt. He gives several reasons for his contention.

He believes that "there is always danger that in strengthening our military armament . . . we may incur the temptation to use our increased force in an offensive direction." The Monroe Doctrine he thinks "we are pushing a little too far." By asserting this established doctrine of the country too radically "we may place ourselves in the position of interfering too far in the affairs and with the rights of other nations." He does not like the San Domingo treaty. The policy which dictated that treaty "is likely to lead not in the ways of peace, but to those complications

arising from interference in the affairs of other nations and carrying the peril of the chance of war." Such a policy once entered upon would almost inevitably lead us to go beyond mere revenue collecting and disbursing for the settlement of debts, into the assumption of control of the general foreign relations of the state which we were trying to aid. This policy, he feels, "is certainly a departure from the well established Washingtonian policy of non-entanglement for our country which has stood till these later days."

Mr. Long states admirably the peculiar danger of having a big navy at a time when there is nothing for the ships to do except to drill and manœuvre. "There is a tendency to gather some of the small craft, including now and then a big one, at any point where the telegraph suggests that there has been a riot or an uprising or a threat of change of government in some of the countries south of us." Taking a hand is then a very easy thing for naval officers to do. The ex-Secretary of the Navy feels that in this regard we should be careful to cultivate "reserve and self-restraint" and "to be very sure that it is our own business which we are minding."

Because of the present strength of our navy, Mr. Long holds "that the recent system of appropriating every year for large numbers of new battleships is not wise and is going too far and too fast." He would have had Congress "refrain this year from appropriating for any battleship." The heavy expenditures which the government is making "for the navy in a time of peace, on the basis of a time of war, are a little out of keeping with our position as a peaceful nation. Too great a navy will be regarded not in the light of protection but of menace, and of temptation to involve ourselves in the affairs of other nations, and so to incur the danger of being drawn into their wars." It will inevitably awaken suspicion about us abroad.

All these observations of Mr. Long are, as far as they go, most just, and might have been stated much more positively than he has stated them.

It seems to us, however, that the support which he gives in this same article to the idea that our country ought to have a large navy, corresponding to our increasing national development, weakens very greatly the force of all that he says in opposition to present increase. Mr. Roosevelt would instantly claim that that is all he is asking for, measuring the national development, of course, by something more than the mere increase of population. One of Mr. Long's special reasons for refraining for the time being from further enlargement of the navy is because he fears that the people will become so alarmed thereby that the reaction will prevent what he calls the slower and healthier development of it. In other words, let us not have a big navy now, that we may be sure to have one in the long run! But